

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 2, 2009. Claims 19, 23, 26, 28, 30, 31 and 33 are pending in the application, of which Claims 19, 26, 28 and 31 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 28 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 28 to clarify an input step, a first selection step, and a second selection step that allow a resource to have multiple names displayed, with each name being associated with a print language. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the method of Claim 28 generates a useful, concrete and tangible result, namely the display having the retained resources identified by multiple names that are each associated with a print language. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 19, 23, 26, 28 and 30 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Allegedly Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,506 (Ukai). Claims 22, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over AAPA and Ukai in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,099,869 (Forstall). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention is directed to retaining a resource which is used in image processing; inputting multiple display names associated with different print languages for the retained resource; selecting a first display name corresponding to a first printing language for the resource from among the multiple display names input by the input means, or information

indicating that a display name is not displayed corresponding to the first printing language; and selecting a second display name corresponding to a second printing language which is different from the first printing language for the resource from among the multiple display names input by the input means, or information indicating that a display name is not displayed corresponding to the second printing language

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 19 is directed to a data processing apparatus, which communicates with an image processing apparatus that processes image data by using resources retained in memory. The apparatus includes retention means for retaining a resource which is utilized in image processing; input means for inputting multiple display names for the resource retained by said retaining means; first selecting means for selecting a display name corresponding to a first printing language for the resource from among the multiple display names input by the input means, or information indicating that a display name is not displayed corresponding to the first printing language; and second selecting means for selecting a display name corresponding to a second printing language which is different from the first printing language for the resource from among the multiple display names input by the input means, or information indicating that a display name is not displayed corresponding to the second printing language.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely AAPA and Ukai, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the apparatus of Claim 19. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of setting multiple display names of a resource, each of which is associated with different print languages wherein the display names may be set for each of the resources and for each print language used in the image processing apparatus.

The AAPA discloses two methods of assigning aliases to the same resource. In the first method, the number of resources that must be retained in memory is equal to the number of names. Accordingly, the same resource is redundantly retained in storage if there is more than one name. In the second method, a retained resource's name is converted and displayed based on information held beforehand by a dedicated program for a print language. In such a case, the name conversion cannot be executed when base information is not held in the dedicated program for a print language.

According to the both methods, a resource is held with a name. In the first method, each name for a resource stores a copy of the resource. In the second method, one resource is held with one name. Therefore, the AAPA fails to disclose one resource that has multiple names.

Applicant submits that Ukai merely discloses "renaming" a file, and is seen to be unconcerned with a resource having multiple names associated with different print languages. Ukai fails to disclose a method of assigning multiple aliases to a resource according to different print languages.

In contrast to AAPA and Ukai, the present claims feature an "input means", "first selection means" and "second selection means" as characteristic elements. According to those elements, a resource is allowed to have multiple names displayed, with each name corresponding to an associated print language. Thus, different names can be utilized for respective print languages for a single resource when displayed in a user interface.

In light of the deficiencies of AAPA and Ukai as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 19 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 26 is directed to a data processing apparatus using specified retention, input, first selecting and second selecting units, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 26 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 28 is directed to a data processing method substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 28 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 31 is directed to a computer-readable medium storing a computer program substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 31 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

### CONCLUSION

The Director is authorized to charge the \$130 one-month extension fee to Deposit Account No. 50-3939. The Director is further authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/  
Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS\_WS 3685738v1